



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EDITORIAL.

EDITORS, E. D. COPE AND J. S. KINGSLEY.

IT is generally conceded that it is important to avoid the duplication of names of like rank in the nomenclature of each of the great divisions of organic life. A genus of plants may bear the same name as a genus of animals, but no two genera of either must bear the same name. There has, however, recently developed a difference of opinion as to what constitutes identity of name. It was for a long period assumed that any difference is a difference, and that words identical except as to masculine or feminine termination are different words. Thus no one thought of regarding *Picus* and *Pica* as duplicates, and the two appeared together in ornithologies for nearly a century. But the desire for change stimulated somebody to consider the use of one of them a duplication of the other, and a new name was proposed to take the place of the one which was introduced latest. Following this example, numerous changes have been proposed for the same reason. But there are other instances where the difference extends to two letters, as in the case of *Menodus* and *Menodon*, and here also change has been introduced. If a difference of two letters is not enough to preserve two names, it becomes a question how many letters will constitute diversity, and so on. There seems to be a preference also that a difference of a letter in the beginning of a name is of greater moment than such a difference towards or at the end of a name. Thus no one has proposed to change the name *Tinodon* because there is also a name *Dinodon*, or *Momus* because there is a *Mimus*, or *Mora* because there is a *Mola*. The number of changes which may be made on such grounds as these is very great, and the name-changers have yet a large field before them.

From another point of view we can see that if differences of one or two letters are not admissible, we are debarred from the use of a large proportion of possible names. Thus we cannot have *Manodus* nor *Monodus*, nor *Melodus* nor *Tenodus*, nor

Henodus, nor Menopus, nor Menotus, on account of Menodus, and so on *ad infinitum*. The fact is, the changing of a name which differs by a single letter from another name has no warrant in any rule, or in common sense. The changing of names is an inconvenience to be avoided as far as possible, and the zeal frequently seen to make such changes without sufficient ground should be abated. When the correct spelling of a name makes it identical with another, change is necessary, since a name is only recognizable when correctly spelled. Science is nothing if not accurate.